
PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 5

**WITNESS AGAINST
FRANK**

**NOW ACCUSES
SLEUTHS**

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 7

**ASSERTS THEY
TRIED**

**TO MAKE HER
SWEAR**

FALSELY ABOUT HIM

Miss Nellie Wood Tells
How

“Questions Confused
Her.”

Mrs. Nettie Miller
Says She

Was Offered \$1,000
Bribe

MRS. PETTIS DISCREDITS

HER SISTER'S AFFIDAVIT

Young Woman,
However, Re-
iterates Statement
Made at
Trial That She Knew
Frank's
Character Was Bad

Four of the affidavits from women witnesses in the Frank case were made public by the attorneys for the defense of the

condemned man on Saturday afternoon. One of the women who testified against Frank's character repudiates her testimony. Another tells in her affidavit, what she had promised the detectives to say in event she was cross-examined, and her sister-in-law makes an affidavit saying the statement the girl had prepared to make is false. The maker of the fourth affidavit asserts that she was offered \$1,000 as a bribe to give evidence against Frank.

Probably the most interesting of the affidavits is that of Mrs. Mattie Miller, of 585 Marietta Street, who declares that A. S. Colyar, Jr., offered to write a check for \$1,000 provided she would make a false charge against Leo M. Frank, and swear to it at the factory superintendent's trial. The woman, who worked at the factory in 1910, says that she refused the offer.

Mrs. Miller in talking with a Journal reporter Saturday evening corroborated every detail of her affidavit. She declares that Colyar represented himself to her as an attorney collecting evidence against Frank. When questioned about the appearance of the man, who told her he was Colyar, Mrs. Miller gave reporters an accurate description of the man.

Miss Nellie Pettis, a 16-year-old girl, who testified at the trial that she knew Frank's character to be bad, has made an affidavit in which she swears she visited the National Pencil factory four times, and that on all of these occasions "Frank looked hard at her" and that on the fourth visit, he stood close to her and remarked in a low tone, "How about it?"

Miss Nellie Pettis went to the factory three times to get her the pay of her sister-in-law, Mrs. Lille Mae Pettis, and once in an effort to get work.

HOLDS TO ORIGINAL STORY.

Mrs. Lille Mae Pettis in her affidavit says that she believes her sister-in-law's statement to be false, for the reason that on the occasion to ask for work Frank was not here, and she interviewed Miss Eula Mae Flowers, a forewoman. On the other

occasions the girl went direct to the same forelady with a written order for Mrs. Pettis' pay, and the forelady gave it to her without her having to see Leo Frank, Mrs. Pettis Swears.

Despite the charge made by Mrs. Lille Mae Pettis that her statement is not true, Miss Nellie Pettis sticks to the story, which she told the detectives at first, and she asserted that she was telling the truth even when she made the affidavit for the defense.

Miss Nellie Wood pays her respects to three of the city detectives and incidentally to Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey in her affidavit.

Miss Wood took the stand as a character witness against Frank, but hesitated to such an extent that her testimony is not included in the brief of evidence of the case.

Miss Wood declares that Detectives Chewning, Norris and Rosser repeatedly attempted to get her on record as making false statements against Frank.

The detectives would sit around her asking questions which she did not understand, she says, and as a result she became greatly confused in her talks with them.

After the trial, Miss Wood says she had a talk with Solicitor Dorsey and that he told her that he had intended to make her his "star witness," but had been greatly disappointed in her testimony on the stand.

The four affidavits of the defense, which will be used as a part of the

(Continued on Page Two, Column One.)

PDF PAGE 2, COLUMN 1

WITNESS AGAINST FRANK NOW
ACCUSES SLEUTHS

**WOMAN SAYS
SHE
WAS OFFERED
BRIBE
TO DAMAGE
FRANK**

Mrs. Nettie Miller
Declares

She Was Offered \$1,000 to Testify Against Frank —Wit- nesses Repudiate Testimony

(Continued from Page 1.)

extraordinary motion for a new trial for Frank follow:

**AFFIDAVIT MADE BY
MISS NELLIE WOOD.**

Georgia, Fulton County.

Personally, appeared Miss Nellie Wood, of Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia who upon oath deposes and says that she was a character witness in the case of the state of Georgia vs. Leo M. Frank.

Deponent says that the first time she ever heard of the first intimation she ever had that she was to be in any way connected with the case was after a visit to her home, which was at that time at No. 8 Carpet Street, when City Detectives Chewning and Norris called upon her and asked deponent if it were not a fact that she had at one time worked at the National Pencil factory; and deponent informed them that

she had been employed there for a period of two days. Detectives Chewning and Norris asked deponent if it were not a fact that the reason she left there, was because Mr. Leo M. Frank had been so familiar with her and so insulted her that she could not stay there, and deponent told them that any such thin was not a fact.

Deponent explained to the detectives aforesaid that she went to the factory in the capacity of a forelady and that she had never before had any experience in the pencil business, and it was necessary for Mr. Frank to give her a great many instructions about the business.

Deponent further says that girls and women employed at the pencil factory did not feel kindly toward her as they had worked there several years and did not like the idea of having a forelady step in over them; and deponent says that the girls referred to endeavored to make it unpleasant for her during her short stay there, and deponent admits that the actions of the girls at times caused her to lose her temper and she would go into Mr. rank's office and make complaint to him regarding said girls and women; and it was on occasion of these complaints that any action on the part of Mr. Frank that could be termed familiar took place.

DESCRIBES FRANK'S ACTIONS.

In description of the action on the part of Mr. Frank referred to, deponent says that when she would go into his office and make complaint, Mr. Frank always appeared to be anxious to keep down strife and trouble between the girls and herself and to pacify her own excited condition he would pat her on the shoulder and say: "That is all right, now; don't you let those little things worry you; the girls will soon get over it and everything will be all right."

Deponent says that at no time could she interpret the actions of Mr. Frank and the patting on her shoulder which he did during these conversations as familiarity, and no

believes, and has always believed, that Mr. Frank was a perfect gentleman and that he did not intend to convey to her the impression that he was trying to become intimate with her at any time; and deponent says that she explained all these details to the detectives, Chewning and Norris, but they would insist that deponent admit that Mr. Frank had been unduly familiar with her and that on this account, she had left the factory.

Deponent says that Detectives Chewning and Norris did not call on her any more and that she was next approached by Detective Bass Rosser, who approached deponent in about the same manner as Chewning and Norris; and deponent told Detective Rosser practically the same story that she had told Detectives Chewning and Norris, which is described above.

Deponent says that during her conversation with Detective Bass Rosser he would ask her a great many questions which deponent could not understand and that he was constantly taking down notes from their conversation and deponent did not see the notes and does not now know what they were.

DISAPPOINTED DORSEY.

Deponent says that one day during the trial, the date of which she can not remember at this time, Detective Rosser came to her and handed her a subpoena to come to court and gave her instructions to call at Mr. Dorsey's office before going to court. Deponent complied with the request and after reaching Mr. Dorsey's office, she found that Mr. Dorsey was in court and did not get to see him until after she had gone on the stand. Then deponent had a conversation with Mr. Dorsey in his office and Mr. Dorsey frankly told deponent that he was very much disappointed with her evidence and that he had intended to make her his star witness, but since she had faltered so badly, he did not see where he could use her any further to advantage. At the same time Mr. Dorsey

explained to deponent that she was a great disappointment to him from the standpoint of a witness. Then deponent explained to Mr. Dorsey personally that it was impossible for her to go on the witness stand and swear to anything against Mr. Frank by reason of the fact that she had only known him about two days and that nothing had taken place during that time upon the part of Mr. Frank that was ungentlemanly, and that Mr. Frank had in no way insulted her, and in fact, that she knew nothing against Mr. Frank one way or the other, either for or against Mr. Frank; deponent now says that all her dealing with Mr. Frank during the two days that she was employed at the factory were upright and manly on his part and she never heard any of the girls at the factory say that Mr. Frank had acted in any unbecoming or familiar manner toward them at any time.

CONFUSED BY DETECTIVES.

Deponent says that either Detective Chewing, Norris or Rosser or perhaps all of them, but just which she can not now individually recall, while talking with her at her place of business, would endeavor to make her admit that Mr. Frank had, while talking to her in his office, grabbed her and attempted acts of violence or perversion, all of which insinuations she promptly denied; deponent now says that when these questions were being asked her, they were put and asked in a very confusing manner by reason of the fact that she was actually surrounded by detectives and that the first one and another would ask her questions and deponent can not now recall just how the questions were asked or who asked them, but does recall that repeated attempts were made by the detectives referred to, to get her on record and have her make statements that were not true.

Deponent states that after she had a conversation with Solicitor Dorsey and explained to him that none of the insinuations that he told her he understood had come from

deponent were true. Mr. Dorsey said to deponent: "Well, I have been misled and did not understand the situation."

(Signed) NELLIE WOOD.

MRS. MATTIE MILLER MAKES OATH TO ALLEGED BRIBE

State of Georgia, Fulton County.

Mrs. Mattie Miller, deposing, on oath, says that she resides at 585 Marietta Street, in the city of Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia, and that she worked at the National Pencil factory, in this city, for about six months in the year 1910. Deponent states that she has known Leo M. Frank when she sees him, and also that she never knew him at any time to be familiar with anyone employed at the factory, and at no time was he familiar with her, neither did she ever see him commit any act that was unbecoming of a gentleman.

Deponent further states that, in the latter part of May or the first part of June, 1913, a man named A. S. Colyar called on her at her home, which was then at 597 Marietta Street, and told her he was a lawyer and she was trying to work up evidence against Leo M. Frank for the murder of Mary Phagan, and asked her if she did not at one time work at the National Pencil company's factory. Deponent replied that she did, and then he asked her to make a statement, and she promptly informed him that Mr. Frank had never made any advances toward her.

OFFERED HER \$1,000.

Then said Colyar asked her if she would not swear that he met her in his office, and added, if she would make an affidavit to that effect, that he would write her a check for \$1,000. Deponent became insulted and indignant at Colyar's offer and promptly told him to leave her house; and, when Colyar saw that she was angered he told her not to get mad, that he was only making her a fair business proposition; and he further added, "We will give

you \$1,000 for such an affidavit delivered from the witness stand.” Deponent again told him that under no circumstances would she swear to a lie for him or anyone else for any amount of money. Then Colyar asked her if she would not swear that Mr. Frank had at least attempted to become familiar with her, and deponent told him that under no circumstances would she swear to a lie for him.

Just before Colyar left her house he asked her not to tell that anyone had been to see her; but deponent did not promise him not to tell it.

Deponent further states that some two or three days after the conversation referred to herein, she met Colyar accidentally on Marietta Street, near the Bijou theater, and he again asked her to go to the soda fountain at the corner of Forsyth and Marietta Street and to meet him there, saying he would have some money for her. Deponent did not go to the said fountain, as she wanted nothing to do with Colyar; and deponent further states that she has never seen him since.

This statement is made of her own free will and accord, without any promise of reward of any kind.

(Signed)

MRS. MATTIE MILLER.

**MRS LILLE MAE PETTIS
ATTACKS HER SISTER-IN-
LAW’S TESTIMONY.**

Georgia, Fulton County.

Personally appeared Mrs. Lillie Mae Pettis, of o. 43 Girard Street, Atlanta Fulton County, Ga., who upon oath deposes and says that on three occasions while she was employed at the National Pencil factory in this city, and for various reasons, she sent her sister-in-law, Miss Nellie Pettis,

to the pencil factory for her pay, each occasion on which she sent her sister-in-law, Miss Pettis, to the factory being Saturday, which was the regular factory pay day.

Deponent says that on each occasion that she sent Miss Pettis to the factory for her pay, she gave Miss Pettis a written order for her salary addressed to Miss Eula Mae Flowers, deponent's forelady.

Deponent further says that on each occasion when she sent Miss Nellie to the factory for her pay, deponent's place of residence was then at the home of Miss Nellie Pettis, and her mother, which was No. 9 Oliver Street, in this city.

Deponent also says that when Miss Nellie delivered her salary on the first two occasions that deponent had sent her after same, deponent asked Miss Nellie what Miss Flowers said to her with reference to deponent and her absence from the factory, and that Miss Nellie replied that Miss Flowers had not said anything whatever regarding deponent, but that Miss Flowers simply handed her deponent's money without remarks.

Deponent also says that on the third occasion when Miss Nellie went to the factory for deponent's pay, she accompanied Miss Nellie as far as Forsyth and Hunter Streets and waited there until Miss Nellie went in the factory after deponent's pay and deponent says that Miss Nellie was not in the factory exceeding five minutes. Deponent says that as soon as Miss Nellie got out of the factory with deponent's pay, she asked her if Miss Flowers had asked her any questions regarding deponent and miss Nellie again replied that Miss Flowers did not ask her any questions but had gone into the office secured deponent's pay and handed it to her.

IN FACTORY BUT FOUR TIMES.

Deponent says that Miss Nellie never said anything to her about meeting or seeing Mr. Frank on any of the occasions she had been to the factory; and deponent further

says that Miss Nellie was never at the factory but four times, three of these times being described in the above statement. The fourth occasion was more than a year ago, when Miss Nellie accompanied deponent to the factory for the purpose of seeking a position in the factory under Miss Eula Mae Flowers; that Miss Nellie asked Miss Flowers for a position and that the application for this position took place about 7:10 a. m., and before Mr. Frank had come to the factory, deponent being familiar with the fact that Mr. Frank did not reach the factory until 8 a. m. Deponent says that after making application to Miss Flowers for a position, Miss Nellie immediately left the factory; and deponent is sure that Miss Nellie did not any time come in contact with Mr. Frank and is further sure that if she had seen him in the factory she would not have known him as deponent had never at any time pointed out Mr. Frank to her and Miss Nellie had never told her that she knew Mr. Frank.

FIRST NEWS OF INSULT.

Deponent also says that Miss Nellie never stated to her that she had ever been insulted at the factory by Mr. Frank or anyone else; and says further that the first time she ever heard Miss Nellie say that Mr. Frank had insulted her was on the occasion of the first visit to Detective Bass Rosser to her home, at No. 9 Oliver Street, when Mr. Rosser had called upon deponent asking her to swear against Mr. Frank; and says that during the conversation between deponent and Mr. Rosser that Miss Nellie was present and interrupted the conversation by stating to Mr. Rosser that she could tell something against Mr. Frank. Deponent says that Mr. Rosser immediately dropped his conversation with her and applied his attention to Miss Nellie. Deponent says that she heard Miss Nellie tell Mr. Rosser that on one occasion when she had been sent by deponent to the pencil factory to get deponent's salary that Mr. Frank had winked at her and asked her "How about it?" Deponent says that there was

another man with Mr. Rosser on the occasion on the conversation referred to; that she does not know who this man was, but that he took a statement from Miss Nellie, which was signed by Miss Nellie in deponent's presence. Deponent further says that after Detective Rosser and the man with him left their home, she said to Miss Nellie: "It is very peculiar that you never before mentioned that Mr. Frank or anyone else had insulted you while at the pencil factory." Deponent says that Miss Nellie replied that she had decided to keep the matter to herself and admitted that she had never mentioned it before telling it to Detective Bass Rosser.

(Signed)

LILLIE PETTIS.

MISS' NELLIE PETTS STICKS TO ORIGINAL TESTIMONY.

Georgia, Fulton County.

Personally, appeared Miss Nellie Pettis, of No. 9 Oliver Street, Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia, who, upon oath, deposes and says:

That she is sixteen (16) years of age, and that she was a witness in the case of Georgia vs. Leo M. Frank for the murder of Mary Phagan, and she further says that, if she had been cross examined, she would have sworn that each time she went to the factory, Mr. Frank would look hard at her, and on one occasion Mr. Frank said to deponent: "How about it?" Deponent says that, when Mr. Frank made the above remark to her, that she was standing off near a lot of other girls in the factory, and that when Mr. Frank made the above remark he made the remark in a very low tone, so that no one else would hear it. Deponent says that Mr. Frank never spoke to her at any other time, but always looked at her in a sly manner.

Deponent says that she was never at the pencil factory but four times, one time to ask for work, and three times for the purpose of getting the pay of deponent's sister-in-law, whose name is Mrs. Lille Mae Pettis, and on each of these visits, deponent presented a note to Miss Eula May Flowers, and deponent personally secured her sister-in-law's money from her.

Deponent says that aside from the above statements, she knows nothing about Mr. Frank or the case, or the charge against him. However, deponent says that she knew Miss Mary Phagan.

(Signed)

MISS NELLIE

PETTIS.

Clergyman to Give Sermon on Frank

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)

CHATTANOOGA, Tenn., March 14.—That Leo Frank has not had a fair trial, and that the whole country should rise up and demand that he be given one will be the contention of Rev. L. Robinson, the pastor, in his sermon at the First Universalist church her Sunday morning.

"I will, in my sermon tomorrow morning," said Dr. Robinson, "take the same position that has been taken by The Atlanta Journal and will reiterate and emphasize it. Frank should have a fair trial, and then if he is found guilty, he should suffer the penalty prescribed by the laws of Georgia."

“Nevertheless, I will urge in my sermon tomorrow morning that capital punishment is radically wrong and that the Christian people should have the law changed.”

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 5

**ALBERT McKNIGHT
IS**

**FOUND BY THE
JOURNAL**

Negro Witness in Frank
Case

Who Recently
Disappeared

Is at Colored
Infirmary.

Albert McKnight, colored, one of the many individuals made famous by the Frank case, who disappeared after making an affidavit a few weeks ago, in which he repudiated his testimony against Leo Frank, has been found by The Journal.

At 1:30 this morning he was at Fair-haven infirmary (colored), 197 West Mitchell Street, with a bruised face and some injured ribs. He was reported asleep and in no serious danger. The nurse said he would probably be out in a few days.

Though it was not known positively at the infirmary just how or where Albert got hurt, it is probable he is the same negro brought into the Terminal station shortly before 9 o'clock Saturday night, suffering from injuries received in the railroad yards south of the station.

Some weeks after Leo Frank was ar-

(Continued on Page Nine, Col. 4.)

PDF PAGE 9, COLUMN 4

ALBERT M'KNIGHT IS FOUND BY THE JOURNAL

(Continued from Page One.)

rested, Albert McKnight, whose wife, Minola McKnight, was cooking at the Frank home when Mary Phagan was killed, gave an

affidavit to city detectives in which he swore that Frank stayed at home only a few minutes on the afternoon of Saturday, April 26, and ate no lunch. He swore his wife told him she overheard Mrs. Frank say Frank slept on the floor that night and acted as if he were in great distress of conscience. At the Frank trial McKnight swore to this same story. A few weeks ago, McKnight made an affidavit to Detective Burke, employed by the Frank defense, in which he swore that his testimony and his original affidavit were false. Then he disappeared, and Solicitor Hugh Dorsey could not find him to testify in the trial of Jim Conley as an accessory after the murder of Mary Phagan.

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 6

LEO FRANK ANSWERS LIST OF QUESTIONS ON PHAGAN MURDER

Says He Didn't
Recognize Con-

ley's Writing in Notes,
but

Later Informed
Detectives

Conley Could Write

DENOUNCES CHARGE
THAT

WIFE WOULDN'T
SEE HIM

Cites Testimony to Prove He

Left Factory at 1 o'Clock,

Touches on "Blood Spots"

and Attacks Conley Story

A series of written questions, bearing upon important phases of the evidence introduced against him by the state at his trial were propounded to Leo M. Frank by the newspaper men Saturday afternoon. To each of these questions Frank made a written reply.

These questions and Frank's answers, covering points that have been the subject of considerable discussion on the part of the public, follow:

HERE ARE QUESTIONS.

Q. Why did you not recognize the notes to be in Conley's handwriting when you and others were examining them at police headquarters the Sunday after Memorial Day?

A. I simply did not know Conley's handwriting. There are seven other negroes employed at the factory in one capacity or another. I had also received notes from some of them. I had no more reason to remember Conley's scrawl than that of the others. A superintendent of a factory can not be expected to recognize the handwriting of every one of his negro employees.

Q. The state has convicted you of the murder of Mary Phagan. The theory the state gives is that you committed the murder in the metal room on the second floor of the pencil factory. What answer have you to this?

A. The state's theory as to the murder being committed on the second floor of the pencil factory rests upon three contentions, viz: (1) The hair found on the lathe; (2) the spot by the dressing room alleged to be blood; (3) Conley's testimony.

The contention as to the hair has been disproved to every fair-minded man and exploded by Dr. Harris' recent revelation.

The supposed "blood spot" was nothing but paint. There are many such spots all about the factory, on account of the paint used in the painting of pencils. The factory used three or four shades of red paint which, when on the floor might look like blood. On the second floor was one of the factory's paint storage rooms from which paint was distributed for all the factory. On April 26 there must have been about 60 gallons of red and brown paint in the second floor, storage room, not to speak of 150 gallons of other colors.

At the trial Dr. Claude Smith, the prosecution's chemical expert, declared that he examined four chips taken from this spot. He found paint or stain on three of the chips. On the fourth chip he found paint and four blood corpuscles. He could not say positively that this was human blood.

I am told that a single drop of blood contains several million corpuscles. These are so very small that if one thousandth part of one drop of blood, which is about as large as the point of a needle, were placed under the lens or magnifying glass of a microscope such as Dr. Smith used, there would easily be visible about 10,000 corpuscles. The part of the spot that looked like blood was shown by Dr. Smith's analysis to be paint. If the spot had really been caused by blood from Mary Phagan's head, the number of corpuscles would have been countless, and would have been found on all four chips.

As to Conley's testimony, I am obliged to leave it to the intelligence and fair-mindedness of the community whether his successive perjuries, his motive to lie, the most powerful that could actuate a human being, and the

(Continued on Page 6, Col. 4.)

PDF PAGE 6, COLUMN 4

FRANK ANSWERS QUESTIONS

(Continued from Page One.)

utter improbability of his story, does not render it unworthy of believe.

THE WRITING OF CONLEY.

Q. Why did you not state that Conley could write as soon as you learned that Conley had been arrested on May 1?

A. On May 1, I was taken to the Tower. I understand that the negro Conley was arrested on the same day, though at that time I did not know it.

No suspicions were directed toward Conley at that time, and no one dreamed of what was to follow later. His name was not in the Atlanta newspaper, as far as I remember from May 1 until May 18, when his first confession appeared. I had no inkling that he was denying he could write, and had supposed that he had been put through the same handwriting test by the police as were all the other suspects in the case, including Lee, Mullinax, Gantt as well as myself.

Just as soon as I learned that Conley denied being able to write, I immediately gave the information in regard to Conley's having signed an installment contract for a watch. The detectives took up this clue, located the contract and thus forced Conley to admit that he could write. His confession thereupon followed.

It will thus be seen that I am the very man who enabled the detectives to unearth and prove the most powerful and significant fact in this entire case.

Q. Conley testified that on Friday, April 25, you asked him to come to the factory Saturday morning to watch. Did you know at that time, or any other time prior to her coming to the factory on Saturday morning that Mary Phagan was coming to the factory Saturday morning, April 26 or at what hour she was coming, and if you would be alone when she did come?

A. There was no possible way for me to know or imagine that Mary Phagan would come to the factory on April 26. It is a proven fact that on that day at least thirty people called at the factory, and saw me at my work in my office. I had no idea of how many people were coming to the factory that day or when they were coming. I certainly could have had no knowledge in advance as to when I would be left alone, or that I would be left alone at all.

Q. The record of the case discloses that Conley is the only witness who testified you had been guilty of perversion. What is your theory as to why this was brought into the case?

A. This was brought into the case to poison the minds of the public and the jury, so that any charge thereafter brought against me, no matter how absurd, would be believed and swallowed whole. In my opinion, this nasty lie is chiefly responsibility for my conviction, and its dirty work overshadowed every real issue in the case.

VISITS OF HIS WIFE.

Q. What of the contention of the State that your wife refused to visit you for ten days after your arrest?

A. This is a dastardly insinuation and absolutely false. My wife as at the station house to see me on April 29, when first detained. She was on the first floor in company with some of her relatives. I was on the top floor with Rabbi Marx. Word was sent to me that my wife wanted to come up to see me. I consulted with Dr. Marx, and decided that as I expected to be liberated in a few hours, or a day or so, at the longest, I would save my wife the slight of myself under arrest surrounded by detectives and officers.

My wife hysterically pleaded to see me, but I thought I would soon be out of custody, and requested her to return home without seeing me. As long as I was detained at police headquarters, I was in a private room, where I had the use of a Bell telephone. I had hourly and constant telephone communication with my wife. She still insisted upon coming down to see me, but I refused.

On May 1, I was carried to the Tower. There I could use no telephone to communicate with my wife, but for the next ten days every friend who came down to the Tower, who had previously seen her, brought a message from her, entreating me to allow her to come to see me I still declined because I could not bring myself to allow her to see me behind the bars of a jail. When my hopes of immediate release were disappointed, I finally consented that she might come. I simply wanted to spare her the pain and distress of seeing me under such conditions. Since then, my wife has been to see me every day, and spends most of her time with me.

Q. Conley testified that you and he were in the factory on Saturday, April 26, from four minutes to 1 to 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon. What answer do you make to this?

A. On Saturday, April 26, I left the factory at 1 p. m. or a minute or two thereafter, locking the factory doors when I left. Miss Kern testified at the trial that she saw me on the corner of Whitehall and Alabama streets between 1:05 and 1:10, I caught the car for my home at this corner. Mrs. Miller now says she saw me at the same place and time. Mrs. A. P. Levy, who lives opposite my home, testified she saw me get off the Georgia avenue car near my home on Georgia avenue at about 1:20 p. m. My parents-in-law and Minola McKnight testified that I arrived at my home for lunch at about 1:20 p. m., and that I sat down and ate my lunch. Albert McKnight, a prosecution witness, testified he was at my home and saw me there before 1:30 p. m. I certainly could not have been in two places at the same time. The wealth of testimony and the truth refutes Conley's unsupported assertion. The wealth of testimony and the truth refutes Conley's unsupported assertion. His statement in regard to what he and I did from 12:56 to 1:30 p. m. on April 26 is a lie out of the whole cloth, is absurd on its face, and has been thoroughly disproved!

Q. Conley says that prior to April 26, and during the year 1912, he watched for you on various Saturday afternoons. What is your answer to this?

A. This is but another of Conley's infamous lies. His story about watching is preposterous on its face. Aside from this, at the trial, it was proved that not alone was Conley's story about watching for me untrue, but was impossible. Among those who so testified were Messrs. Darley, Schiff, Bauer, Weinkauf, Montag, Gottheimer, Mann, Chambers, Payne, Nix, Campbell, Stelker and Hollway. Some of these men were at the factory with me, not alone on the Saturday afternoons in question, but on all other Saturday afternoons.

Up to the previous to January 15, 1913, the first or street floor of the factory building was occupied by the Clark

Woodenware company. Their employees and the National Pencil Company's used the same street entrance—the same entrance that Conley says he watched. The Clark Woodenware company also worked on Saturday afternoons. It was impossible for me—not to speak of Conley—to have controlled anyone who wished to enter the building when the entrance was being used by both of the firms.

ATTACKS CONLEY'S STORY.

Conley states that April 26 was the first time he watched since January 1, 1913. Conely could have stopped no one previous to January 15, 1913, and as per his own testimony, he did not watch after that time till April 26. It is a remarkable fact that of all the times he said he watched he never mentioned one person whom he had ever stopped. That is simple to account for. First, he never was watching, and second, he could not have stopped anyone! What white person desiring to enter the building could he have stopped? Anyone desiring to enter the factory would have brushed by Conley (if he had been watching) and entered in spite of him!

If at times, when the first floor was unoccupied, I should have desired any privacy in the factory, I possessed the keys of the building and could have locked the factory doors. If I had desired to be alone, I certainly needed no one (white or black) to watch for me.

Factory officials, employees, salesmen and friends have all at one time or another visited me in my office on Saturday afternoons. They found me not behind closed or locked doors, but at work and easily accessible. They never saw a negro look-out or any indecent thing occurring in my office. This was amply brought out at the trial. In addition, my wife was a frequent visitor at my office on Saturday afternoons, often helping me with my work.

Against this bulk of human evidence and the physical facts. Conley's unsupported story about watching utterly falls to pieces.

**JOURNAL STAND
PRAISED**

**MANY ADD
INDORSEMENT
TO JOURNAL'S
EDITORIAL**

**Scores Declare Leo M.
Frank**

**Should Have New
Trial**

Some more of the many letters received by The Journal, indorsing its editorial suggestion that Leo M. Frank should have a new trial are printed below. While the majority of these letters were written by Atlantians and Georgians, quite a number came from persons residing in other states, and many were written by women.

One of the strongest letters of indorsement in the list printed today was written by Harvey L. Parry, the Atlanta court reporter, who took down the testimony in the Frank trial. The authors of several of them are lawyers.

Following are the letters:

FROM HARVEY L. PARRY.

March 11, 1914.

Mr. James R. Gray, City:

My Dear Mr. Gray—Thank you so much for that editorial in your issue of yesterday. It was timely, courageous and splendidly written. I was on the verge of pessimism. It looked to me as though it was time for our grand old state to pull down her sign. “Wisdom, Justice, Moderation,” so ornamental to the Gateway to the South, and replace it with something like this: “We Judicially Murder;” but, with a few well-balanced, well-informed and able men like this editorial proves you to be to those who were not already aware of that fact—men of convictions and the courage to express them in the face of overwhelming opposition—we may hope to consistently retain our old motto. It is to be hoped there are other editors who will take advantage of this opportunity to prove their courage by demanding a new trial in this case.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. PARRY.

FROM MRS. K. D. M. SIMMS.

Box 175, Summerville, S. C., March 12, 1914.

Mr. James R. Gray:

Dear Sir— Please allow me to thank you for your editorial of March 10. The words are those of a brave and just man, and of a paper strong enough to stand for fair play and truth.

I am not of Frank's race or religion, and had never heard his name until the case came up; but his trial is such a monstrous disgrace to the state of Georgia that I felt thankful that one at least dared speak in the cause of justice and truth.

I pray your words will bear fruit.

Cordially yours,

KATE DRAYTON

MARGARET

SIMMS.

FROM T. B. RICE.

Greensboro, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga.:

Dear Sir—I wish to congratulate you on the editorial in The Journal of March 10 on the Frank case.

It takes courage under such conditions as seem to exist in this case.

I do not know Frank and am not satisfied as to his guilt or innocence. I believe that thousands of thinking people will agree with you.

If he is guilty, he ought to be hanged, but he should at least be given a fair trial, regardless of the cost to the state or the clamor for vengeance.

Respectfully,

T. B.

RICE.

FROM W. L. BARNHART.

Agent

STANDARD SCREEN CO.

Chicago, Ill.

Office, 702 Empire Building,

Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Journal, City.

Dear Sir: I want to thank and congratulate you on your strong and fearless plea in last night's paper in the interest of justice and the fair name of the state of Georgia, and incidentally in connection with the Frank case—I say incidentally, because the Frank case is not only incidental but secondary to the great principle of justice and truth, which apparently is about to be outraged by the execution of a man who may or may not be guilty, and whose conviction was so largely in response to the public clamor for a victim to appease the wrath of an outraged public feeling.

True, a victim has been found, but who can lay his hand upon his heart and look into the face of his Maker and say that there exists no uncertainty, no misgivings in his mind as to the guilt of this man, and who knows but that another murder will be committed if this man is allowed to be executed with all the mystery and uncertainty surrounding this case; and a murder more horrible in its consequences to the state and society than the one it is designed to avenge.

I impute no dishonest motive to any one, but simply believe that it was practically impossible amid the feverish excitement and intense feeling that filled the very air and depicted upon every face, revealing the fires of vengeance that were at white heat in every heart for the guilty party—

simply waiting for the finger to be pointed toward one—amid such surroundings it would be more than human to have remained calm and uninfluenced, whether in the jury box or in the pew. And be it said to the everlasting honor of a courageous and honest judge who had listened to every word of evidence, seen the manner of testifying of all the witnesses and with his long experience still said after both sides had closed that he was uncertain. Unless the state's officers who are charged with the responsibility of ferreting the truth can more effectively lift this cloud of mystery and uncertainty, the state will take fearful chances in executing this man.

Again, applauding you for your manly and honest expressions and high endeavor to promote justice and fair play, I beg to remain.

Very truly yours,

W. L. BARNHART.

FROM A. P. CARSWELL.

A. P. CARSWELL

Manufacturer of

Yellow Pine, Cypress Lumber and Ties.

Hortense, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal

Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Sir: I want to commend you for your editorial in today's paper, "Frank Should Have a New Trial." In the spirit of fairness Frank should have a new trial and I believe you have voiced the feeling of the law-respecting citizens of this country.

Yours very truly,

A. P. CARSWELL

FROM MRS. F. H. HOOK.

Rutherfordton, N. C., March 12, 1914.

James R. Gray,

Editor Atlanta Journal:

My Dear Mr. Gray—What I have longed to see appeared yesterday in your paper—an editorial on a new trial for Frank, “a square deal,” as it were. Surely there is nothing more that can possible be said. You did cover the ground fully and we are proud of you, and I feel sure that every honest, cultured man and woman who reads this editorial will feel likewise. With more men like yourself, there would be fewer suffragists.

With high regards,

Very truly,

MRS. FRANCES H. HOOK.

FROM EDITOR T. S. SHOPE.

Dalton, Ga., March 13, 1914.

To Hon. James R. Gray, Atlanta, Ga.:

Dear Mr. Gray—I was gratified to see you take a stand in behalf of a new trial for Leo Frank. The more one studies about this trial and takes into consideration the circumstances surrounding it the more ridiculous it seems that he should hang without having a new trial.

Of course, he was convicted on the uncorroborated evidence of Jim Conley, and I submit that this is not enough evidence upon which to base a capital offense. A great many people have spoken to me about the trial recently, and every

lawyer I have talked to says that the Frank trial was simply a farce. Even the people in the country that have read and kept up with it are of the opinion that a new trial should be given him.

I am sure that intelligent public sentiment and opinion will indorse your attitude in the main.

With best wishes, I beg to remain.

Very truly

yours,

T. S.

SHOPE.

FROM R. R. BURGER.

Watkinsville, Ga., March 13, 1914.

Hon. J. R. Gray, Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your fearless and convincing editorial on Frank's case is commended by the bar and county officers here.

You have but performed a duty to the country and to journalism. The spirit of the Frank trial was deplorable and you have described it so vividly and convincingly that there should be no doubt it was wrong.

Yours truly,

R. R.

BURGER.

FROM RRIDDELL BROS.

RIDDELL BROS.

Engineers, Machinists, electricians.

Office and Works,

15-19 E. Mitchell St.,
Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Mr. James R. Gray,

Editor Atlanta Journal, City.

Dear Sir: We beg to congratulate you on your editorial in The Journal of yesterday, referring to the Frank case. We have felt that a great injustice was about to be done by the state of Georgia in sending a man to death, without a fair trial. And we have found a great many fellow citizens who were of the same mind.

It certainly took courage for you to take the stand you do in the face of the very general determination to make a sacrifice of Leo Frank as the statement of the solicitor. "That he would never bring Conley to trial," indicated that unless Frank was hung no one would be punished for the crime.

Very truly,

RIDDELL BROS.

FROM FRANK M. SCOFIELD.

FRANK MARVIN SCOFIELD,
1007 Fourth Nat. Bank Bldg.
Bell Phone 4275.

Atlanta, Ga., March 10, 1914.

Editor of The Journal.

I cannot refrain from expressing my gratitude to you for your most timely, manly and splendid stand upon the Frank matter in your editorial of this date.

I am one of those who have been unable to get over the doubt of the guilt of this man, and know that I am only one of many.

Very truly yours,

FRANK M. SCOFIELD.

FROM A. P. HERRINGTON.

A. P. HERRINGTON & SON,

Real Estate Loans.

205 Peters Bldg. Phone Main, 1131.

Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal.

All me to commend you for your editorial on the Frank case in your issue of the 10th. I do not know Mr. Frank, but I have felt all along that justice was miscarried, and have an abiding faith that truth will prevail, and when it does you will be proud to know the influence of your great paper had been tempered with justice, it is incredible to my mind how anyone could be executed in Georgia upon the evidence of a drunken negro who possibly may be trying to shield himself. Any way your editorial is worthy of consideration from all who believe Frank guilty. I again commend you.

Respectfully,

A. P.
HERRINGTON.

FROM JUDGE J. S. JOHNSON.

Office of J. S. Johnson, N. P.,

Ex-Officio J. P.,

612 District, G. M.,

Butts County.

Jackson, Ga., March 12, 1914.

Mr. James R. Gray,

Editor Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga.:

My Dear Sir—I want to commend you upon the stand you take in your editorial in The Journal of Tuesday, March 10, on the Frank case, which has been before the people so much for the last year or more. I want to say that I have read everything in the way of evidence brought out and published in your paper, also all discussion of the case by attorneys for and against Frank.

I have taken careful notice of all the rulings of the courts during the trial and during the hearing for new trial, rehearing and all, and I am, in the language of Judge Roan, “I am not convinced either as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner.”

I hold a position of some responsibility in my community. I have a large family of children, both male and female, and I feel the great responsibility of a parent, of a citizen and of an officer of the law of our state. With these responsibilities resting upon me, I feel that I am doing nothing but my duty as a citizen when I say, with you, that justice should be done this man by giving him a fair trial. For I can say, according to my judgement, he has not, and could not, have been, given a fair trial under the circumstances at the time and under the circumstances surrounding the court when he was tried.

I say let him be tried, and, if guilty, be found so upon evidence unquestioned and corroborated by facts beyond a reasonable doubt, coming from sources which could be considered true by a fair and unprejudiced jury.

Has this been done? I say no, according to my judgement.

I extend to you, as a law-abiding citizen, my thanks for the bold stand in this important.

Yours very

truly,

J. S. JOHNSON.

FROM MRS. W. E. SCOTT.

Chambilee, Ga., March 10, 1914.

Hon. James R. Gray:

Dear Sir—Upon your editorial of this afternoon, “Frank Should Have a New Trial,” let me congratulate you and thank you for your great justice and bravery.

I so heartily indorse every word, for they are true, and have so wished that the papers would have the courage to do as you have done, I even said I would write and ask it, but felt my insignificance.

Like you, I do not know the man, but he must have fair trial.

Respectfully,

MRS. W. H. SCOTT.

FROM G. T. ROGERS.

Kingston, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Journal: Your editorial “Frank Should Have a New Trial,” certainly endorses the views of the conservative element in the vicinity.

You are to be commended for pleading the cause of this, what might be, an unfortunate victim of public sentiment.

Yours very truly,

G. T. ROGERS.

FROM EDWARD C. CLARKSON.

Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914.

James R. Gray, esq., Atlanta Journal.

Dear Mr. Gray:

Allow me to express my sincere appreciation for your fearless editorial in yesterday's Journal regarding the Frank case.

I consider your action one of the finest examples of noblesse oblige, which I believe in great men makes the future destiny of the nation and people assured of the largest and highest progress.

I am, my dear Mr. Gray,

Very truly yours,

EDWARD C. CLARKSON

FROM R. M. CRUMLEY.

Hon. Jas. R. Gray,

Atlanta, Ga.

Dear sir. Your article in the "Atlanta Journal" on March 10th, regarding the Frank trial was read with much interest. This editorial is my humble opinion, the strongest and most timely that has appeared in the Atlanta papers in months. The plain, strong, fearless statement as you make it will do much towards the ends of justice, which, I can hardly feel that this unfortunate has had.

I write you this as a lover of justice and as an admirer of the stand that you take.

Yours truly,

CRUMLEY.

R. M.

FROM J. H. FRANKLIN.

ATLANTA ATHLETIC CLUB.

Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. James R. Gray, Editor Journal.

I want to congratulate you on your editorial in regard to Leo Frank. I do not know Frank but I believe he is entitled to a fair trial and I believe the trial should take place after the public has quieted down and can view the evidence in a calm manner.

Yours very truly,

J. H. FRANKLIN.

FROM W. G. FARGASON.

Musella, March 11, 1914.

Mr. James R. Gray, Atlanta:

Dear Sir—My hat is off to you for your stand in the Frank case. I wanted to ask you for an editorial; now I thank you for yesterday's; it's great. Yours, etc.

W. G. FARGASON.

FROM JOHN R. COOPER.

JOHN R. COOPER

Macon, Ga.

Macon, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Hon. James R. Gray, Atlanta, Ga.:

Dear Mr. Gray—I am glad that you had the nerve to write such a strong editorial on the Frank case in the face of the mob spirit. I am satisfied that the defendant had no legal trial from what I have read of the case. I congratulate you on your able editorial.

Every man charged with crime is entitled to at least a legal trial by a fair and impartial jury untrammelled by the mob spirit. I beg leave to remain yours very truly

JOHN R. COOPER.

FROM “AN OLD WOMAN.”

Milledgeville, March 12, 1914.

To the Editor of the Journal, Atlanta Ga.:

Dear Sir—Allow an old woman who loves Georgia to thank you for your editorial of Wednesday.

The time has indeed come when the press as well as every manly man should speak out and demand another trial, a fair one, for Frank. I congratulate you upon taking the initiative and trust your fearless example may be followed. It is no longer a question as to whether individuals believe the accused to be guilty or not. It has for months been a question of justice. He has not had a fair trial; no thoughtful and fair person can claim that he has.

I do not know Mr. Frank, I had never heard of him until this dreadful case became public. But I am an ante-bellum woman, and my heart has been sore for Georgia since such scenes could occur in her courts as did occur in this man's trial. Do not let the state be further disgraced. I cannot agree with your estimate of the judge, jury or lawyers, otherwise I thank you greatly for your article. Truly yours,
M. C. B.

FROM JOHN L. FOWLER.

Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Mr. J. R. Gray.

Dear Sir: I have tried to get you over phone. (Out of city is all I got.)

Please accept heartfelt congratulations for your editorial of March 10, on the Frank case, which expressed my sentiment better than I could in words, let alone with a pen. I am an American, work for the W. & A. railroad, and live near Ingleside on Georgia railroad. Let justice be done. I believe Conley is the guilty party. No prejudice in my heart. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. FOWLER,

W. & A. shops at Ingleside

FROM T. R. BOOTH.

Charleston, S. C., March 11, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Mr. Editor: Please accept my congratulations on your article in the editorial columns in regard to a new trial for Leo Frank.

Respectfully,

T. R. BOOTH.

31 Moultrie Street.

FROM F. A. JONES.

Butler, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Gentlemen: your editorial on Frank case is correct, and to the point. Am glad your paper has courage to say so.

Respectfully,
F. A. JONES.

FROM J. K. M'CALL.

THE SEWANEE.

Cordele, Ga.

Cordele, Ga., March 11, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal: I was gratified to see you come out with an editorial advocating new trial for Mr. Frank. Another trial will do no harm, and there is no doubt that we have all cooled off and can take a more impassionate consideration of all the facts.

If Leo Frank is guilty, he will be convicted again and if he can prove to his fellow citizens that he is innocent, we would not want to execute an innocent man. It is to be hoped that the court will give him another trial. I don't believe Solicitor Dorsey would want to convict an innocent man and I know it is not the intention of the law to do so, but the object of the law is to disclose all the facts, either for or against the accused.

I believe a majority of the people of the state would be glad that the court would give Frank a new trial, as no one wants him punished unless he is guilty.

J. K. M'CALL.

456 Piedmont Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.

FROM EDITOR W. P. DOZIER.

STILLMORE NEWS,

W. P. Dozier, Editor and Business
Manager.

Stillmore, Ga.

Mr. James R. Gray, Editor, Atlanta.

Dear Sir—I have just finished reading your editorial, “Frank Should Have a New Trial,” and wish to heartily endorse your position. I do not always agree with The Journal’s position; neither am I prejudiced for or against Frank, but I do not think there is in Georgia a fair-minded man who has followed this case who would not say that it was impossible for Frank to get a fair trial under conditions which existed at the time he was tried.

Thanking you for having had the courage to express your opinion on a matter which is of great concern to every good citizen, even though it may be considered improper for a newspaper to do so.

I am very truly yours,

W. P. DOZIER.

PDF PGE 46, COLUMN 4

PRESS COMMENT ON JOURNAL’S EDITORIAL

(Memphis Commercial-Appeal.)

In another column of this paper we reproduce an editorial from The Atlanta Journal on the celebrated Frank case.

Frank is now under a death sentence, and his case has been passed upon by the supreme court.

The Atlanta Journal is one of the strong, honest and conservative papers of the country. It is carefully edited, and a thorough newspaper.

It does not play for favor. It prints the news as it finds it, and its editorial expressions are the result of careful thought. It believes in the truth of what is written on its pages.

The editorial should be given careful study. It throws the light of publicity on the trial of Frank in the lower court, showing that the proceedings did not advance in steady order and with regard for the letter and the spirit of the law which the courts should guarantee to the individual before them.

If a man is guiltless and he is convicted because passion and prejudice and false issues have been committed in the name of the law, and the crime is not only against society, but it is against the law itself.

Even if a man is guilty, to secure a conviction is anarchy if unlawful methods have been brought to bear. Though the man may be guilty, the verdict should not be permitted to stand, and the case should go back and be tried under the forms which are lawful, not only in act, but in spirit.

.....
(Thomas Times-Enterprise.)

The Atlanta Journal, in a leading editorial Tuesday afternoon, in plain language asserts that Leo Frank should be given another trial, and bases the contention on the statement that inflamed public sentiment unquestionably had its effect on the jury and its consequent verdict of murder. It unhesitatingly says, without discussing the merits of the cases or the evidence as brought out at the trial, that, under conditions as they existed at the time, a fair and impartial trial was not possible.

While we have never been fully conversant with either the truth or the possible exaggerations of newspaper accounts of the public sentiment of the people of Atlanta, at the time of this trial, we unqualifiedly indorse the statement of The Journal that he should be granted a new trial in the event that this statement is correct.

In the event that there is the slightest possibility of perjured testimony being used against the man, or the effect of a rabid public sentiment against him, in the name of justice and right, he deserves a new trial and every fair and impartial Georgian will so assert. No man desires to participate, even as a citizen of a state where a man is hanged for a crime of which there is some doubt of guilt.

.....

(Dalton Citizen.)

The Atlanta Journal is to be commended for its bold stand with reference to the Frank case. Since the cooling of passion, and the cessation of the cry for a victim, it would seem that a fair and impartial trial could be held. He was convicted on the uncorroborated testimony of Jim Conley, the negro, after he had been through the "third degree" with the detectives, time and time again. Conley first declared he could not write, and later it was proven he could. The famous notes were without doubt written by him.

It would be an awful thing for the state to hang an innocent man, and on the other hand, it would be equally as bad for the crime for which Frank was convicted to go unpunished. But at the same time it would seem that justice demands another trial.

The Citizen believes in the enforcement of law. It has no sympathy with technicalities that so frequently cheat justice, and makes of the status a disgraceful mockery. The quibbles of lawyers for a fee, the respect the courts seem to have for them, and the other ills from which the state suffers as a result are not respected in these quarters.

Frank is not demanding a new trial on technical grounds. The new trial is demanded because it is apparent that, under the circumstances surrounding the first trial, an impartial, fair trial was impossible. Intelligent people, familiar with the case are obliged to admit it. This fact is inescapable.

Let the law be vindicated, but let it be accomplished, as Junius says in another place on this page, through the medium of “wisdom, justice and moderation.”
